Co. v. *Railroad Commission,* 262 U. S. 625, 633. In reviewing the findings of the state court we are not required to enter a debatable field of fact and to choose and prescribe an invariable method of computation. To justify the overruling of the determination of the state court we must be able to see that what has been done will produce the result which the Constitution forbids. Considering the nature of the property, and upon facts shown by the evidence, the state court has allowed appellant to reserve annually, and use for its own purposes, an amount which according to common experience may be expected to produce a sum adequate to replace the property on the expiration of its life. We find it impossible to say, from a constitutional standpoint, that another method should have been employed or a greater amount allowed.

Appellant also insists that it is entitled to a rate of return of nine per cent. upon the fair value of its property. The Commission and the court decided that seven per cent. was sufficient. We perceive no constitutional ground for complaint on that score. *Wabash Valley Electric Co.* v. *Young,* 287 U. S. 488, 502; *Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation,* 289 U. S. 287, 319, 320.

Third. The final attack is on the form of the Commission's order. The Commission fixed the amount of the annual gross revenue and then prescribed a tentative schedule of rates.[2] Appellant says that it is obvious that no one can tell in advance how many vehicles of different tariff classifications will pass over the bridge in a year and what annual gross revenue will be produced by a given schedule of rates. But, as the prescribed rates are expressly stated to be tentative, there is no ground for assuming that the Commission will reject an application to make such changes in the schedule as experience may show to be necessary in order to produce the stipulated revenue. There is nothing in the order which requires that the test period should be a year or any definite time. From the statements at the bar it appears that appellant has not put the tentative schedule in effect and has made no application to the Commission for a change in the schedule. If the allowance of gross revenue is adequate, as it has been found to be, there is no basis for complaint because of a schedule of rates which on application may be appropriately modified.

The judgment of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania is affirmed.

Affirmed.

---

[2]See Note 1.